UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,201	03/16/2001	Kenneth C.R.C. Arnold	6502.0115-01	5028

22852 7590 02/12/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
ALI, SYED J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2127	13

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/809,201	ARNOLD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Syed J Ali	2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspond nce address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *March 16, 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 3-52 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 3-52 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-12.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 1, "the sending step further comprises," should read "the sending step further comprises:". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3-14, 16-26, 28-39, and 41-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharadhwaj (USPN 6,061,713) in view of Hamilton et al. (USPN 6,009,464) (hereinafter Hamilton).

As per claim 3, Bharadhwaj discloses a method performed on a processor operatively coupled to a collection of servers which enables a client associated with the processor to dynamically distribute a task to a server, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a server to process the task (col. 3 lines 35-55, "The global namer module 118 is hosted by the global namer system 110. Given a name of a service, the global namer module 188 supplies an identifier for the port service module 122 or 124 and domain port to which a request

for the service should be directed. The global namer module 118 maintains an association between names of server programs 112, 114*a-b*, and 116 and the domain ports 132 and 134 through which they are accessed");

forming a task request from parameters and data (col. 3 line 62 - col. 4 line 8, "Line 3 shows the client program making the request for the named service to the port service module 122 via the port registration handle");

sending the task request to the selected server which invokes a generic compute technique capable of executing the task request on the selected server and generates results (col. 3 line 62 - col. 4 line 8, "The port service module then selects the domain port 152 identified by the request, and as shown by line 4, initiates the first instance of the second server program 114*a*"); and

receiving the results back from the selected server (col. 4 lines 31-38, "Line 7 illustrates an identifier of the second server program being returned from the port service module 122 to the client program being returned from the port service module 122 to the client program 102. Thereafter, the client program 102 communicat[es] with the server program 114*a* via the port service module 122 by reference to the identifier and as shown by line 8").

Hamilton discloses the following limitations not shown by Bharadhwaj, specifically the server downloading any needed executable byte code (col. 8 lines 27-44, "code server 110 typically downloads code to application program 1080, n response to requests from document server 1090. In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, code server 1100 downloads Java Language bytecodes which form application programs").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton since the combination thereof increases the flexibility in assigning tasks to servers. Bharadhwaj distributes tasks among available servers based solely on the characteristics of a domain port. This limits the number of servers a task can be distributed to since a server may only be able to handle certain types of requests. Hamilton allows a server to download the documents and processing code necessary to service a request. Thus, the servers in Hamilton are able to service any type of request, thereby adding a degree of flexibility to the selection criteria for determining which server should service a request.

As per claim 4, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the processor is operatively coupled to a computer system having a primary storage device, a secondary storage device, a display device, and an input/output mechanism (col. 2 line 65 - col. 3 line 7, "Each of client system 104, server nodes 106 and 108, and global namer system 110 is a conventional data processing system, where the particular hardware is selected according to the processing needs of programs").

As per claim 5, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the task is developed in a programming language and environment compatible with each of the server computers (col. 8 lines 27-44, "When application program 1080 executes the applets downloaded from code server 1100, application program 1080 is given the information necessary to support network objects and methods requested by network client 1100", wherein the server downloads the code necessary to communicate with the objects of the network client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 6, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the server is selected from a plurality of heterogeneous computer systems (col. 1 lines 25-39, "where there are multiple server programs, each requiring a different protocol, or a similar protocol which is similar in some respects but different in other respects, the work required to program the various server program protocols increases", wherein Bharadhwaj serves to remedy the problem associated with programming heterogeneous computer systems by directing a service request to the server that supports the proper protocol).

As per claim 7, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the environment includes a remote procedure call subsystem (col. 5 lines 14-19, "stubs 250 are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 8, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the remote procedure call subsystem is the Remote Method Invocation [RMI] system (col. 5 lines 14-26, "19, "stubs 250 are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server",

wherein Hamilton is disclosed in accordance with the Java Language specification, and provides an RPC mechanism).

Although Hamilton does not specifically disclose that the RPC subsystem is the RMI system, it is well known that RMI is essentially the remote procedure call system employed by Java. Further, since Hamilton is disclosed extensively as it is applied against the Java specification, the RMI system would fall within the scope of Hamilton. Support for the use of RMI within Java can be found in Kaminsky et al. (USPN 6,157,960) (hereinafter Kaminsky) (col. 1 lines 35-59, "Sun Microsystems released an object oriented programming language called Java which includes a capability similar to that of RPC and DSOM called Remote Method Invocation, or RMI. Using systems which are Java enabled, the programmer can now write a distributed object program without explicit recognition of the network upon which the program will be running").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 9, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 3, wherein selecting the server comprises selecting the server based on the overall processing load distribution among the collection of servers (col. 6 lines 32-39, "The miscellaneous 316 characteristics are used to further define the operational characteristics of a domain port 212. The exemplary miscellaneous characteristics of...load balancing...are well known to those skilled in the art").

As per claim 10, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the selected server has the lowest load characteristic compared with average load characteristic of the servers over a predetermined time period (col. 6 lines 32-39, "The miscellaneous 316 characteristics are used to further define the operational characteristics of a domain port 212. The exemplary miscellaneous characteristics of...load balancing...are well known to those skilled in the art").

As per claim 11, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 3, wherein selecting the server comprises selecting the server based on the specialized computing capabilities of each server (col. 4 lines 52-58, "The characteristics 214*a-n* for a domain port 212*a-n* define various operational behaviors for a domain port", wherein the selection of a server to process a request is based upon these characteristics).

As per claim 12, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 11, wherein the specialized computing capabilities include a capability to render images (col. 6 lines 32-39, "The exemplary miscellaneous characteristics of voting, rerouting, filtering, mirroring, load balancing, striping, compression, encryption, and message logging are well known to those skilled in the art who will also recognize that other characteristics could be implemented with a domain port", wherein a server may implement a myriad of types of processing, including image rendering).

As per claim 13, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the sending step further comprises the substeps of:

determining if code related to the requested task is present on the selected server (col. 8 lines 55-65, "in response to a user selection on the displayed document, the document server may determine that code, in the form of applets, should be downloaded to the application program, step 1140. Alternatively, this step may be skipped entirely, and the process flow continue[s] from step 1130 to step 1150", wherein the document server determines whether or not the code necessary to service a request is present on the server); and

downloading the code onto the selected server when the code is not present on the selected server (col. 8 lines 55-65, "code is downloaded from the code server to the application program").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 14, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the sending step further comprises:

providing the task as a parameter to the generic compute method (col. 3 line 62 - col. 4 line 8, "Line 3 shows the client program making the request for the named service to the port service module 122 via the port registration handle. The port service module then selects the domain port 152 identified by the request, and as shown by line 4, initiates the first instance of the second server program 114*a*").

As per claim 16, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the results are used for further processing on the client (col. 10 lines 25-40, "Later, when the trade has executed, the

brokerage trading system calls up the user's machine and invokes a method on the 'trade' object in the application program to notify the user that the trade is complete", wherein the processing on the client disclosed in this citation is merely one practical application of how further processing may occur).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 17, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the results comprise an object (col. 10 lines 25-40, "In response to a trade command, for example, the application program creates a 'trade' object", wherein the "trade" object disclosed in this citation is merely one practical application of how results are represented as objects).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 18, Bharadhwaj discloses a method performed on a processor operatively coupled to a collection of servers which enables a server associated with the processor to dynamically receive and process a task from a client computer wherein the task is in an executable programming language compatible with each of the server computers, the method comprising the steps of:

retrieving parameters and data from a task request into a task (col. 3 line 62 - col. 4 line 8, "Line 3 shows the client program making the request for the named service to the port service module 122 via the port registration handle");

invoking a generic compute method on the server, which is capable of processing a plurality of types of tasks, which executed the task and generates results (col. 3 line 62 - col. 4 line 8, "The port service module then selects the domain port 152 identified by the request, and as shown by line 4, initiates the first instance of the second server program 114*a*"); and

returning results to the client (col. 4 lines 31-38, "Line 7 illustrates an identifier of the second server program being returned from the port service module 122 to the client program being returned from the port service module 122 to the client program 102. Thereafter, the client program 102 communicat[es] with the server program 114*a* via the port service module 122 by reference to the identifier and as shown by line 8").

Hamilton discloses the following limitations not shown by Bharadhwaj, specifically downloading any needed executable byte code (col. 8 lines 27-44, "code server 110 typically downloads code to application program 1080, n response to requests from document server 1090. In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, code server 1100 downloads Java Language bytecodes which form application programs").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 19, Bharadhwaj discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the processor is operatively coupled to a computer system having a primary storage, a secondary storage device, a display device, and an input/output mechanism (col. 2 line 65 - col. 3 line 7, "Each of client system 104, server nodes 106 and 108, and global namer system 110 is a conventional data

processing system, where the particular hardware is selected according to the processing needs of programs").

As per claim 20, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the task is developed in a programming language compatible with each of the server computers (col. 8 lines 27-44, "When application program 1080 executes the applets downloaded from code server 1100, application program 1080 is given the information necessary to support network objects and methods requested by network client 1100", wherein the server downloads the code necessary to communicate with the objects of the network client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 21, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the task is developed using the Java programming language and environment (col. 5 lines 50-65, "code server 330 downloads Java Language bytecodes which form application programs").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 22, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the environment includes a remote procedure call subsystem (col. 5 lines 14-19, "stubs 250 are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 23, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the remote procedure call subsystem is the Remote Method Invocation [RMI] system (col. 5 lines 14-26, "19, "stubs 250 are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server", wherein Hamilton is disclosed in accordance with the Java Language specification, and provides an RPC mechanism).

Although Hamilton does not specifically disclose that the RPC subsystem is the RMI system, it is well known that RMI is essentially the remote procedure call system employed by Java. Further, since Hamilton is disclosed extensively as it is applied against the Java specification, the RMI system would fall within the scope of Hamilton. Support for the use of RMI within Java can be found in Kaminsky (col. 1 lines 35-59, "Sun Microsystems released an object oriented programming language called Java which includes a capability similar to that of RPC and DSOM called Remote Method Invocation, or RMI. Using systems which are Java enabled, the programmer can now write a distributed object program without explicit recognition of the network upon which the program will be running").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 24, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the retrieving step further comprises:

determining if types related to the task are available on the server (col. 8 lines 55-65, "in response to a user selection on the displayed document, the document server may determine that code, in the form of applets, should be downloaded to the application program, step 1140. Alternatively, this step may be skipped entirely, and the process flow continue[s] from step 1130 to step 1150", wherein the document server determines whether or not the code necessary to service a request is present on the server);

when the types are not available on the server, downloading the types onto the server from a location as indicated by the parameters provided by the client (col. 8 lines 55-65, "code is downloaded from the code server to the application program", wherein the server is able support the given network objects after downloading the appropriate code); and

executing the task based upon the data and parameters provided by the client (col. 8 line 66 - col. 9 line 4, "the application program executes the downloaded code").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 25, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the determining step and the downloading steps are performed by a remote procedure call [RPC] subsystem (col. 5 lines 14-19, "stubs 250 are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claim 26, Hamilton discloses the method of claim 25, wherein the determining step is performed by a Remote Method Invocation [RMI] type of remote procedure call subsystem (col. 5 lines 14-26, "19, "stubs 250 are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server", wherein Hamilton is disclosed in accordance with the Java Language specification, and provides an RPC mechanism).

Although Hamilton does not specifically disclose that the RPC subsystem is the RMI system, it is well known that RMI is essentially the remote procedure call system employed by Java. Further, since Hamilton is disclosed extensively as it is applied against the Java specification, the RMI system would fall within the scope of Hamilton. Support for the use of RMI within Java can be found in Kaminsky (col. 1 lines 35-59, "Sun Microsystems released an object oriented programming language called Java which includes a capability similar to that of RPC and DSOM called Remote Method Invocation, or RMI. Using systems which are Java enabled, the programmer can now write a distributed object program without explicit recognition of the network upon which the program will be running").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claims 28-39 and 41-42, Bharadhwaj discloses a computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system comprising a collection of servers to perform the method of claims 3-14 and 16-17, respectively (col. 2 line 65 - col. 3 line 7, "Each of client system 104, server nodes 106 and 108, and global namer system 110 is a conventional data processing system, where the particular hardware is selected according to the processing needs of programs", wherein a conventional data processing system would contain a computer readable medium containing instructions). The remainder of the limitations in the present claims mirror those of claims 3-14 and 16-17, respectively. Therefore, the discussion presented above for claims 3-14 and 16-17, respectively, form the basis for rejection of the present claims as well.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

As per claims 43-51, Bharadhwaj discloses a computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system comprising a collection of servers to perform the method of claims 18-26, respectively (col. 2 line 65 - col. 3 line 7, "Each of client system 104, server nodes 106 and 108, and global namer system 110 is a conventional data processing system, where the particular hardware is selected according to the processing needs of programs", wherein a conventional data processing system would contain a computer readable medium containing instructions). The remainder of the limitations in the present claims mirror those of claims 18-26, respectively. Therefore, the discussion presented above for claims 18-26, respectively, form the basis for rejection of the present claims as well.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bharadhwaj with Hamilton for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 3.

4. Claims 15, 27, 40, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharadhwaj in view of Hamilton in view of Pal et al. (USPN 6,219,675) (hereinafter Pal).

As per claim 15, Pal discloses the following limitations not shown by the modified Bharadhwaj, specifically the method of claim 3 further comprising the step of indicating to the server that results from a computed task should be stored in a result cache on the selected server for subsequent tasks to use (col. 7 line 47 - col. 8 line 11, "The database objects in the object cache 426 are the results of previous queries performed on the DBMS 206").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the modified Bharadhwaj with Pal since in the case that subsequent tasks perform similar operations, or may perform additional work on an object, storing the result in a cache on the server would reduce the required execution time. That is, rather than distribute the task and parameters to the server again, the server can simply pull the result from cache. This reduces the communication time associated with a network, and is especially beneficial since the RPC mechanism requires that all processing be done remotely.

As per claim 27, Pal discloses the following limitations not shown by the modified Bharadhwaj, specifically the method of claim 18, further comprising the substep of storing the results from the task in a cache if a subsequent task will use the results (col. 7 line 47 - col. 8 line

11, "The database objects in the object cache 426 are the results of previous queries performed on the DBMS 206").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the modified Bharadhwaj with Pal for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 15.

As per claim 40, Bharadhwaj discloses a computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system comprising a collection of servers to perform the method of claim 15 (col. 2 line 65 - col. 3 line 7, "Each of client system 104, server nodes 106 and 108, and global namer system 110 is a conventional data processing system, where the particular hardware is selected according to the processing needs of programs", wherein a conventional data processing system would contain a computer readable medium containing instructions). The remainder of the limitations in the present claim mirror those of claim 15. Therefore, the discussion presented above for claim 15 forms the basis for rejection of the present claim as well.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the modified Bharadhwaj with Pal for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 15.

As per claim 52, Bharadhwaj discloses a computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system comprising a collection of servers to perform the method of claim 27 (col. 2 line 65 - col. 3 line 7, "Each of client system 104, server nodes 106 and 108, and global namer system 110 is a conventional data processing system, where the particular hardware is selected according to the processing needs of programs", wherein a

conventional data processing system would contain a computer readable medium containing instructions). The remainder of the limitations in the present claim mirror those of claim 27. Therefore, the discussion presented above for claim 27 forms the basis for rejection of the present claim as well.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the modified Bharadhwaj with Pal for reasons discussed above in reference to claim 15.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J Ali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Syed Ali
January 26, 2004

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100